



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to make the burden of humanity intolerable, and to deepen the civilized midnight of the world, is as deplorable as it seems incredible.

It is, however, part of the struggle between the two civilizations—the Christian and the Pagan, which is going on continually.

The problem of the future is: “Which is to triumph?” As to the ultimate issue there cannot be the shadow of a doubt. But, if this new national departure be followed up, and the mad policy pursued, the retribution to this country will be terrible indeed.”

It has been foreseen for a long time that sooner or later England would enter actively on army extension, if she did not stop her monstrous naval expansion. It is impossible, in these days of increased facilities for the rapid transportation of troops, for a nation to go into the war preparation business in any direction without taking up ultimately all lines of it. England's great war fleet has provoked the growth of militarism everywhere on land and sea. Her statesmen have talked virtuously about the deplorableness of the “bloated armaments” of the European continent, and have flattered themselves that England was playing the good Christian by developing only her navy and adhering to the voluntary system. Now she finds that the fleets of the other powers are growing rapidly and that in case of hostilities they would be able to land large sections of the great continental armies on her shores in spite of her. She must, therefore, enlarge her army, and, as the *Herald* says, Conscription will inevitably follow in time.

The British fleet and naval stations all about in every available place have been, as we have more than once stated, the chief provocation to this country to build up a navy. It is in vain for members of the British Government and of Parliament to protest that the construction of a new naval station on Santa Lucia has no possible connection with the relations of Great Britain to the United States; large numbers of the people of this country will not believe them. The building of such a station, and all the old stations, *has* to do with the relations of Great Britain to this country and to all other countries, whether directly intended or not. Such movements of the British naval system give at least a show of reason to the irrational opposition of certain United States senators and others to the pending arbitration treaty, which they say is only a British snare in disguise.

The course of militarism in the United States will be the same as in Great Britain. We flatter ourselves that we need nothing but a navy and coast defences. Warships we must have, a lot of them, big and swift, because England and other nations have them. We have not the courage to refuse to follow a detestable example. The result will be, persuade ourselves to the contrary as we may, that when we have at enormous expense put our navy and our coast defences on a par with those of the

other great powers, we shall find ourselves driven by the logic of the situation to increase our army and ultimately to adopt enforced military service. The leaven of militarism, if kept in the national barrel at all, will ultimately spread to all parts of the contents. The only way to escape this fate is to stop, where we ought to stop, with the navy. If Secretary Long, who is in principle a genuine friend of international peace and a strong advocate of arbitration, would seriously recommend, in his first annual report, that the United States navy is already large enough and that when the ships now in construction are completed no more ought to be built, he would accomplish a service for this country and for the civilized world such as no Secretary of the Navy in any country has ever performed, a service like that which Mr. Olney has accomplished in the State Department. If this country or any other had the courage to stop short and declare that it would never take another step in any direction in the extension of the deplorable system of modern militarism, the very “stars in their courses” would defend both its safety and its honor.

THE VETO OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

The last important official act of President Cleveland was the veto of the Immigration Restriction Bill. On the whole, we believe the President was amply justified in returning the bill without his approval, for, though some of its provisions might have remedied a part of the evils of unrestricted immigration, others would certainly have worked mischief in quarters where least of all we ought to think of creating friction. The President's reasons for the veto may be thus summarized:

The provision of the bill that immigrants over sixteen years of age who cannot read and write the English or some other language, though physically and morally capable, shall be excluded, he thinks to be a “radical departure” from our national policy heretofore of welcoming all who come to us, “except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatens danger to our national welfare and safety.” This policy he thinks has been productive of vast benefit in helping to develop the resources of our country, and if it is to be abandoned its disadvantages at the present time ought to be clearly apparent. Besides, reading and writing do not in his judgment provide a proper test of fitness. Many of those who cannot read and write do excellent service as peaceful laborers, while some of the most troublesome of those who come are able to read and write. The accompanying provision that the parent or grandparent, over fifty years of age, the wife or minor child of an immigrant entitled to enter, may come with him or be sent for, provided the immigrant is able to support them, is considered by Mr. Cleveland “indefinite and inadequate.” Though intended to prevent the separation of families,

it makes no provision for brothers and sisters, and does not say in what way the facts of relationship are to be established. Under this provision a husband might abandon an illiterate wife and find an absolutely safe retreat in this country. It also assumes that the relatives of an immigrant entitled to come would in all cases become a public charge unless supported by him, which is not true.

The provision of the bill intended to keep Canadian laborers from crossing the line into the United States and obtaining regular employment, while retaining their home beyond the line, is characterized as "illiberal, narrow and un-American." The language of the veto on this point is as follows:

"When we consider these provisions of the bill, in connection with our long northern frontier and the boundaries of several of our states and territories, often but an imaginary line separating them from the British dominions, and recall the friendly intercourse between the people who are neighbors on either side, the provisions of this bill affecting them must be regarded as illiberal, narrow and un-American.

The residents of these states and territories have separate and special interests, which in many cases make an interchange of labor between their people and their alien neighbors most important, frequently with the advantage largely in favor of our citizens. This suggests the inexpediency of federal interference with these conditions when not necessary to the correction of a substantial evil affecting the general welfare. Such unfriendly legislation as is proposed could hardly fail to provoke retaliatory measures, to the injury of many of our citizens who now find employment on adjoining foreign soil."

On this last point, Mr. Cleveland is clearly in the right. There is no imaginable excuse found in the relations of the citizens dwelling on the border for making it a crime against the law for citizens of Canada to come across and obtain employment from time to time in the territory of the United States. If our citizens or corporations did not want them and need them, they would not hire them. This unworthy thrust at Canada in the bill ought to have secured its defeat, even if it had been good in all other particulars.

The problem of immigrants at the present time is confessedly a difficult one. But any attempted solution of it which makes no further provision for the improvement of the millions of illiterate and as yet un-Americanized foreigners already here, can hardly be called a solution. Again there is no reason to believe that those who may hereafter come will be worse than those who have already arrived, but rather the contrary. There is likely also to be an actual falling off in the numbers of those coming, as recent statistics show. Besides this, the educational facilities of our States are much better than they were twenty years ago and are constantly improving, so that it will be possible hereafter to educate immigrants more rapidly than in the past. Facilities for cheap transpor-

tation into the less densely populated portions of the West are likewise better than formerly. We are certainly better able on the whole to take care of and transform rapidly into Americans those now coming than we were those who came some years ago, even if they do come faster. It must be remembered, too, that we have shown an extraordinary capacity for turning these foreigners into good, intelligent, patriotic citizens after a generation or two, and it cannot be shown that, at the present time, on the whole, after the influx which we have received, our institutions are weaker or less respected than they have heretofore been. Taking the country at large, we believe they are distinctly stronger than they have ever before been. We have no objection to a simple reading and writing test being tried in the case of all immigrants over sixteen years of age, though we doubt seriously whether such a test would do much for the general improvement of the character of those who would come. It would certainly for a time lessen the number, and this in itself would be an advantage. But if such a test is tried, it ought not to be in a complicated way, as was proposed in the vetoed bill. It ought to be a simple and unconditional test. If such a statute were enacted, it would soon become known abroad, and families intending to immigrate would make an extra effort to learn to read and write, so that there would probably be not much greater hardship on account of separation of families than is now the case, and possibly less. There is nearly as strong ground for applying the reading and writing test to the wife as to the husband.

This bill passed the Senate by only three majority. It is questionable whether a majority of the citizens of the United States are in favor of any such restrictive measure. If none such is enacted, and the present law remains in force, we shall not by any means expect to see the country go down under the weight of the ship loads of foreigners who are weekly landing on our shores. If our American civilization has not religious and political vitality and strength enough to bear up under this burden, it is perilously near ruined already and will soon sink under the weight of some other load.

ADIN BALLOU AND TOLSTOÏ.

A good deal of interest has been awakened by a recent remark of Hon. Andrew D. White at Harvard University that he was told in Russia by Tolstoï that the American author who interested him (Tolstoï) most was Hosea Ballou. A number of communications have appeared in the *Boston Herald* claiming that the man meant was Adin and not Hosea Ballou. However the mistake may have occurred, we have no doubt that it was Adin Ballou whom Tolstoï meant, as he not only agreed with Tolstoï in the doctrine of non-resistance but was also in frequent correspondence with the Russian reformer. The follow-